



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,287	02/28/2002	David Wigley	304122US8	2035

22850 7590 12/06/2007
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/06/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/086,287

Applicant(s)

WIGLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Remarks

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon (U.S. Patent 6,233,618) in view of Kester (U.S. Patent 7,194,464) and Gusler (U.S. Patent 6,917,980).

Regarding Claim 1,

Shannon discloses a computer based method for restricting access to network accessible digital information by network users of at least one subscriber network, the method comprising the steps of:

Monitoring at a subscriber network requests by the network users for digital information (Column 12, lines 37-52);

Determining whether a location indicator associated with a request is included in a database of restricted location indicators maintained at the subscriber network and denying the request where the location indicator is in the database (Column 14, lines 16-41; the database of restricted location indicators being the restricted destination database);

Retrieving at the subscriber network digital information stored at a location corresponding to the location indicator and initially analyzing content of information at the location in the event that the location indicator is not in the database and denying or fulfilling the request based on the initial analysis (Column 14, line 49 to Column 15, line 4), wherein searching of the database and the initial content analysis occur at a network bridge at the subscriber network (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3);

But does not explicitly disclose periodically forwarding the location indicators not in the database from the subscriber network to a remote node or that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time.

Kester, however, discloses periodically forwarding location indicators associated with requests and not in the database from the subscriber network to a remote network node (Column 6, lines 16-32);

Retrieving at the remote network node information stored at a location corresponding to the forwarded location indicator and further

analyzing a content type of the retrieved information (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45); and

Periodically dispatching to the at least one subscriber network from the remote node location indicators found by the further analysis to have restricted type content stored therein, for inclusion in the database of restricted location indicators maintained at the subscriber network (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content filter adaptation system of Kester into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon in order to allow the system to efficiently categorize content at a central facility by providing uncategorized location indicators from subscriber networks, wherein the location indicators can be prioritized for faster results on content that is more frequently requested or believed to be part of a certain category, and to disseminate such information in a timely and efficient manner.

Gusler, however, discloses that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time (Abstract; Column 5, line 63 to Column 6, line 33; and Column 7, lines 10-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the dynamic filtering system of Gusler into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester in order to allow the system to provide dynamic and intelligent analysis of content from each

source, as opposed to a decision based on a single document, thereby providing a more complete analysis of what content is allowed from what sources.

Regarding Claim 11,

Claim 11 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the digital information includes content accessible via the Internet (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 12,

Claim 12 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 2 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 3,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the subscriber networks are LANs wherein client computer communicate via the Ethernet access protocol (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 4,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 3, in addition, Shannon discloses that the network bridge is an Ethernet bridge (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 4 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is a URL (Column 8, lines 24-34).

Regarding Claim 15,

Claim 15 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 5 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 4, in addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is extracted from an Ethernet frame originating from a client computer of a network user (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 16,

Claim 16 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 6 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 8,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses determining whether the location indicator is in an exception list before determining whether it is in the database and fulfilling the request in the event that the location indicator is in the exception list (Column 13, line 52 to Column 14, line 15).

Regarding Claim 18,

Claim 18 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 9,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Shannon discloses that the request is fulfilled in the event that the location indicator is in the database but is a permitted category of restricted content (Column 14, lines 16-25).

Regarding Claim 19,

Claim 19 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 21,

Shannon discloses a computer software program, stored in a computer readable medium, comprising instructions configured to cause a computer to execute a method for restricting access to network accessible digital information by the network users of a subscriber network, the method comprising:

Monitoring requests by the network users for digital information wherein the subscriber network includes respective client computers for the network users (Column 12, lines 16-52);

Determining whether a location indicator associated with a request is included in a database of restricted location indicators stored at the subscriber network, wherein the location indicator is extracted from a data frame originating from the network user request (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3; and Column 15, lines 16-41);

Analyzing a content type of information stored at a location corresponding to a location indicator not in the database, and denying or fulfilling the request based on the analysis, wherein location indicators are extracted and content analyzed by a network bridge installed at the subscriber network (Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3; and Column 14, line 49 to Column 15, line 4);

But does not explicitly disclose periodically forwarding the location indicators not in the database from the subscriber network to a remote node or that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time.

Kester, however, discloses Periodically forwarding location indicators associated with requests and not in the database to a remote network node (Column 6, lines 16-32);

Allowing the remote network node to retrieve the digital information stored at a location corresponding to the forwarded location indicator for further analysis of a content type of the retrieved information (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45); and

Computer readable program code for periodically receiving from the remote network node location indicators found by the further analysis to have restricted type content stored therein, and including the received location indicators in the database (Column 7, line 17 to Column 8, line 45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content filter adaptation system of Kester into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon in order to allow the system to efficiently categorize content at a central facility by providing uncategorized location indicators from subscriber networks, wherein the location indicators can be prioritized for faster results on content that is more frequently requested or believed to be part of a certain category, and to disseminate such information in a timely and efficient manner.

Gusler, however, discloses that the initial analysis is performed for a predetermined maximum time (Abstract; Column 5, line 63 to Column 6, line 33; and Column 7, lines 10-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the dynamic filtering system of Gusler into the content filtering and access

control system of Shannon as modified by Kester in order to allow the system to provide dynamic and intelligent analysis of content from each source, as opposed to a decision based on a single document, thereby providing a more complete analysis of what content is allowed from what sources.

Regarding Claim 22,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 21, in addition, Shannon discloses that the digital information is content accessible via the Internet (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 23,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 22, in addition, Shannon discloses that the subscriber network is a LAN wherein the client computers communicate via the Ethernet protocol (Column 5, lines 34-44).

Regarding Claim 24,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 22, in addition, Shannon discloses that the location indicator is a URL (Column 8, lines 24-34).

Regarding Claim 25,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 23, in addition, Shannon discloses that the data frame is an Ethernet

frame originating from a client computer of a requesting network user
(Column 5, line 34 to Column 6, line 3).

Regarding Claim 27,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 21, in addition, Shannon discloses determining whether the location indicator is in an exception list before determining whether it is in the database and for fulfilling the request in the event that the location indicator is in the exception list (Column 13, line 52 to Column 14, line 15).

Regarding Claim 28,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler discloses the method of claim 21, in addition, Shannon discloses fulfilling a request in the event that the location indicator is in the database but is a permitted category of restricted content (Column 14, lines 16-25).

3. Claims 7, 17, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon in view of Kester and Gusler, further in view of Maurer (Maurer et al., "Hash Table Methods", 1975, pp. 5-19).

Regarding Claim 7,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose that the database is stored in encrypted form and is searched for an encrypted location indicator.

Maurer, however, discloses that the database is stored in encrypted form and is searched for an encrypted location indicator (Pages 5-7, Introduction). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hash table of Maurer into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to provide a faster method of storing and searching for a specified URL within an organized database of hashes.

Regarding Claim 17,

Claim 17 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 7 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 26,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose encrypting the location indicator before including it in the database or determining whether the encrypted location indicator is in the database.

Maurer, however, discloses encrypting the location indicator before including it in the database or determining whether the encrypted location indicator is in the database (Pages 5-7, Introduction). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the hash table of Maurer into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in

order to provide a faster method of storing and searching for a specified URL within an organized database of hashes.

4. Claims 10, 20, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon in view of Kester and Gusler, further in view of Willens (U.S. Patent 5,889,958).

Regarding Claim 10,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis.

Willens, however, discloses that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis (Column 4, lines 26-45; and Column 5, lines 38-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the remote access control system of Willens into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to keep the databases more up to date, thereby providing better filtering and/or to allow the system to be run on a client that does not have a hard drive (dedicated Internet terminal).

Regarding Claim 20,

Claim 20 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 29,

Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler does not disclose that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis.

Willens, however, discloses that forwarding and updating of the databases are performed on at least an hourly basis (Column 4, lines 26-45; and Column 5, lines 38-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the remote access control system of Willens into the content filtering and access control system of Shannon as modified by Kester and Gusler in order to keep the databases more up to date, thereby providing better filtering and/or to allow the system to be run on a client that does not have a hard drive (dedicated Internet terminal).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2137


J. D. POPHAM
EXAMINER